

dangerous to both Church and State, as the sworn henchmen of the papacy, and therefore hostile to Gallican liberties, as the instruments of Spain and the League, and the advocates of regicide. France, he warned, would be the prey of innumerable evils from the nefarious machinations of these intriguing fathers. In reply, Henry magnanimously, but not too wisely, made light of the fears of the First President, and skilfully adduced all that could be said in favour of toleration. He defended them from the charge of ambition by pointing to their poverty and their refusal of ecclesiastical dignities. He could see in the antagonism of their ecclesiastical opponents only the antagonism between ignorance and learning. Were not their hardest critics the ecclesiastics of evil life? He refused to believe that they taught the doctrine of regicide. Because Chatel was a Jesuit, was it reasonable to believe that every Jesuit was a Chatel, that all the apostles were Judases because there was one Judas among the Twelve? He refused to believe, too, that they would sacrifice to the pope the allegiance they owed to their king. Certainly a great stretch of faith, considering their past attitude in things political. That, however, he added, was ancient history. They had believed that they were acting a right part, and, like others, they had deceived themselves. Toleration should be granted to every Frenchman willing to be a loyal subject, and this toleration he was resolved to enforce. "Leave this affair to me," he concluded; "I have managed others far more difficult, and think only of doing what I tell you!"

No exception could be taken to the edict, if the conditions as to reservations were honestly observed. But was it possible for the militant order of the Church *par excellence* to refrain from troubling "the repose of the kingdom"? Could the recall of the Jesuits be anything but the revival of the League under another name? Could the Jesuits observe faith with the Huguenots, and refrain from plotting against them? Henry evidently believed so, but he as evidently did not know an order which absorbs the citizen in the ecclesiastic, and places Church and pope above State and king. He overlooked the fact that they were as much a political party as a religious order, doubly dangerous, because they knew how to cloak political aims with religious pretences; and if it was dubious